

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

- S089843 Paul Rodriguez, Respondent
2nd Dist. v.
B127935 Arrow Trucking Company, Appellant
Div. 1 Pursuant to written request of counsel for petitioner, the above-entitled petition for review is ordered withdrawn.
- S088207 People, Respondent
3rd Dist. v.
C030088 Douglas Leighton Griffith, Jr., Appellant
The order filed on July 19, 2000, is hereby amended to reflect the above-captioned corrected case title.
- S014394 People, Respondent
v.
Fermin Rodriguez Ledesma, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including August 14, 2000.
No further extensions of time will be granted.
- S028970 People, Respondent
v.
Richard Stitely, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including October 6, 2000.
- S033975 People, Respondent
v.
Michael Stephen Combs, Appellant
On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including October 3, 2000.
No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S034473 People, Respondent

v.

Christian Antonio Monterroso, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including October 6, 2000.

S040575 People, Respondent

v.

Delaney Geral Marks, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including August 23, 2000.

S083842 In re Raymond Anthony Lewis

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including September 5, 2000.

No further extensions of time will be granted.

S086569 In re Marlin Jones, Jr.

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and the informal response is extended to and including September 3, 2000.

S089463 In re Dennis Harold Lawley

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including September 26, 2000.

S014200 People, Respondent

v.

Jon Scott Dunkle, Appellant

The application of appellant for permission to file an opening brief in excess of the page limit is granted.

2nd Dist.
B136819

In re Alanna C., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law

The justices of Division Six of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, have recused themselves in the above entitled matter. The matter is therefore transferred to another Division of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District.

S088572 In re **Joseph Henry Marman** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Joseph Henry Marman, State Bar No. 129517**, be suspended from the practice of law for 90 days, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year on condition that he be actually suspended for 30 days. **Joseph Henry Marman** is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation, including restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed April 4, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the calendar years 2001 and 2002. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S088573 In re **E. John Vodonick, a.k.a. Emil J. Vodonick** on Discipline

It is ordered that **E. John Vodonick, a.k.a. Emil J. Vodonick, State Bar No. 63089**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years subject to the conditions of probation, including restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed March 30, 2000. Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

S088575 In re **Stephen Leslie Wheeler** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Stephen Leslie Wheeler, State Bar No. 39466**, be suspended from the practice of law for five years and until he makes and provides proof of the restitution specified below, and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for two years and until he makes restitution to: (1) Nancy Orr, by paying to the Client Security Fund \$50,000.00, plus 10% interest per annum from December 23, 1996, and by paying to Nancy Orr the unpaid interest on \$55,000.00, at a rate of 10% per annum from September 13, 1993 to December 23, 1996, plus the principal amount of \$5,000.00, 10% interest per annum from December 23, 1996; (2) Richard Halderman, Jr. (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$1,244.50, plus 10% interest per annum from January 1, 1995; (3) Leo and Jean Thome (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$2,208.39, plus 10% interest per annum from September 1, 1993; and (4) pays sanctions in the matter of *Malpezzi v. Douglas* (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$750.00, plus any costs, plus any interest ordered by the court, and provides satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel; and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct; and until he develops a law office management plan as outlined in the Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition filed March 13, 2000. **Stephen Leslie Wheeler** is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on March 13, 2000. He is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S088576 In re **Charlotte A. Hassett** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Charlotte A. Hassett, State Bar no. 140285**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that she be actually suspended from the practice of law for 90 days and until she pays to Michael R. Dougherty (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) \$661, plus 10% interest per annum from the effective date of this Order and until she provides proof thereof to the State Bar Probation Unit; and until she complies with Business and Professions Code section 6002.1(a)(1); and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate her actual suspension pursuant to rule 205, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed October 22, 1999, as modified by its order filed April 20, 2000. She is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating her actual suspension. If she is actually suspended for two years or more, she shall remain actually suspended until she provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of her actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that she comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*See Business and Professions Code section 6126, subdivision (c).

S088578 In re **Richard Hamm** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Richard Hamm, State Bar No. 61401**, be suspended from the practice of law for 120 days and until he shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional

Misconduct; and until he pays restitution to Chinh Q. Pham (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$4000 and provides proof thereof to the State Bar Probation Unit, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that respondent be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed December 20, 1999, as modified by its order filed February 29, and March 28, 2000. Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

S088579 In re **Michael Vincent Johnson** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Michael Vincent Johnson, State Bar No. 100957**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation, including six months actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed April 18, 2000. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)